

Remarks

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the present U.S. Patent application as amended herein. In the present response, claims 1 and 18 have been amended. Claims 7-9 and 24-26 have been canceled. No claims have been added, Claims 1-6 and 10-17 are pending.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C § 112, First Paragraph

Claims 1, 7, 8, 18, 24 and 26 were rejected as failing to comply with the written description requirement. Claims 7, 8, 24 and 26 have been canceled. Therefore, the rejection of claims 7, 8, 24 and 26 is moot. Claims 1 and 18 have been amended. Accordingly, Applicants request that the rejection of claims 1 and 18 be withdrawn.

Claim Rejection - 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) - Claims 18-26

Claims 18-26 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over U.S. Patent No. 6,484,011 issued to Thompson (*Thompson*) and U.S. Patent No. 7,069,573 issued to Brooks (*Brooks*). Claims 18-26 have been canceled. Therefore, the rejection of claims 18-26 is moot.

Claim Rejection - 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) - Claims 1-17

Claims 18-26 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over U.S. *Thompson*, *Brooks*, and U.S. Patent No. 6,560,637 issued to Dunlap (*Dunlap*.) For at least the following reasons set forth below, Applicants submit that claims 1-17 are not rendered obvious by *Thompson*, *Brooks*, and *Dunlap*.

The Office Action points to *Dunlap*, column 2 lines 10-14, as disclosing:

“ . . . local formatting on a device . . . ”

See page 9.

Dunlap does not convert data based on “characteristics of the handheld device” but rather on converting “slides from a proprietary format to a standard graphical format prior to transmission . . . ” See column 2 lines 11-12. This conversion is “operative to convert the slides and documents stored in presentation files to presentation image files encoded in a standard graphical image format, such as JPEG or GIF, . . . ” See column 4 lines 19-22. This is not a conversion based on characteristics of the handheld device, but rather the characteristics of the presentation files (wherein it is converted to a JPEG or GIF.) This type of conversion is fixed, and not affected by dynamically changeable characteristics of the handheld device, and therefore a much simpler conversion. (For example, the conversion does not have to deal with real-time data simplifying, as described in page 10 lines 3-20 of the specification.) Therefore, *Dunlap* does not cure the deficiencies of *Thompson* and *Brooks*, and the combination of *Thompson*, *Brooks*, and *Dunlap* cannot teach or suggest the invention as claimed in claims 1, 7, and 8.

Claims 2-6 and 10-17 depend from claim 1. Claim 9 depends from claim 8. Because dependent claims include the limitations of the claims from which they depend, applicants submit that *Thompson*, *Brooks*, and *Dunlap* cannot teach or suggest claims 2-6, 10-17, and 9 for at least the reasons set forth above.

Conclusion

For at least the foregoing reasons, Applicants submit that the rejections have been overcome. Therefore, claims 1-6 and 10-17 are in condition for allowance and such

action is earnestly solicited. The Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned by telephone if such contact would further the examination of the present application. Please charge any shortages and credit any overcharges to our Deposit Account number 02-2666.

Respectfully submitted,

BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN, LLP

Date: January 10, 2008

/Paul A. Mendonsa/

Paul A. Mendonsa
Attorney for Applicants
Reg. No. 42,879
12400 Wilshire Boulevard
Seventh Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90025-1026
(503) 439-8778